

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

Geography Specification A

GGA5 Advanced Level

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

General Guidance for A Level Geography Assistant Examiners

Quality of Written Language

As required by QCA, the marking scheme for this unit includes an overall assessment of quality of written communication. There are no discrete marks for the assessment of written communications but where questions are “Levels” marked, written communication will be assessed as one of the criteria within each level.

- Level 1:** Language is basic, descriptions and explanations are over simplified and lack clarity.
- Level 2:** Generally, accurate use of language; descriptions and explanations can be easily followed, but are not clearly expressed throughout.
- Level 3:** Accurate and appropriate use of language; descriptions and explanations are expressed with clarity throughout.

Levels marking – General Criteria

The following general criteria relate to knowledge, understanding and their critical application and the quality of written communication as outlined in the AQA Geography A subject specification. They are designed to assist examiners in determining into which band the quality of response should be placed, and should be used when assessing the level of response an answer has achieved. It is anticipated that candidates’ performances under the various dimensions will be broadly inter-related and the general guidelines for each level are as follows:

- Level 1:** An answer at this level is likely to:
- display a basic understanding of the topic;
 - make one of two points without support of appropriate exemplification or application of principle;
 - demonstrate a simplistic style of writing, perhaps lacking close relation to the term of the question and unlikely to communicate complexity of subject matter;
 - lack organisation, relevance and specialist vocabulary;
 - demonstrate deficiencies in legibility, spelling, grammar and punctuation, which detract from the clarity of meaning.
- Level 2:** An answer at this level is likely to:
- display a clear understanding of the topic;
 - make one or two points with support of appropriate exemplification and/or application of principle;
 - demonstrate a clear style of writing which clearly addresses the terms of the question
 - demonstrate a degree of organisation and use of specialist terms.
 - demonstrate sufficient legibility of and quality of spelling, grammar and punctuation to communicate meaning clearly.

Level 3: An answer at this level is likely to:

- display a detailed understanding of the topic;
- make several points with support of appropriate exemplification and/or application of principle;
- demonstrate a sophisticated style of writing incorporating measured and qualified explanation and comment as required by the question and reflecting awareness of the complexity of subject matter and/or incompleteness/tentativeness of explanation;
- demonstrate a clear sense of purpose so that the responses are seen to closely relate to the requirements of the question with confident use of specialist vocabulary;
- demonstrate legibility of text, and qualities of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which contribute to complete clarity of meaning.

NB A perfect answer is not usually required for full marks. Clearly, it will be possible for an individual candidate to demonstrate variable performance between the levels. In such cases, the principle of best-fit should be applied. Experience suggests that the use of exemplars within this mark scheme and the discussion, which takes place during the Standardisation Meeting normally, provides sufficient guidance on the use of levels in marking.

Annotation of Scripts

- Where an answer is marked using a levels of response scheme the examiner should annotate the script with a 'L1' 'L2' or 'L3' at the point where that level is thought to have been reached. The consequent mark should appear in the right-hand column. Where an answer fails to achieve Level 1, zero marks should be given.
- Where answers do not require levels of response marking, each script should be annotated to show that one tick equals one mark. It is helpful if the tick can be positioned in the part of the answer, which is thought to be credit-worthy.

General

It is important to recognise that many of the answers shown within this marking scheme are only exemplars. Where possible, the range of accepted responses is indicated, but because many questions are open-ended in their nature, alternative answers may be equally credit-worthy. The degree of acceptability is clarified through the Standardisation Meeting and subsequently by telephone with the Team Leader as necessary.

Question 1

- a) Response should show knowledge and understanding of the nature of resources and the differences between renewable and non-renewable. Renewable being chiefly flow resources derived from contemporary solar energy flows - direct insolation, biomass, winds, wave energy but also tidal energy and low geo-thermal energy. Non-renewable being resources used up at a faster rate than created – fossil energy, metal ores and similar (1-3 depending on detail and development). Credit comments which qualify or clarify the concept of renewability e.g. in terms of rate of biomass cropping or non-renewability in terms of recyclability (1) Distinction in terms of stock/flow (1), polluting/non polluting (1). Language, which clearly emphasises distinction (1). Some reference necessary to Figure 1 for full marks.

(4 marks)

- b) Response should show knowledge and understanding of concept of resources as being that which is useable by human beings to help satisfy human needs and wants within a given level of technology, technical capacity, cultural predisposition, values and so on (1-2). A sense of this latter will be essential for full credit for which responses also need to refer to the process of economic development, widening the resource frame of reference, some materials/flows/phenomena becoming resources, others ceasing to be resources, creating new demands and needs, etc (1-3 depending on detail and development which can include appropriate illustration and exemplification). Allow up to 2 marks for responses which focus on changes from renewable to non-renewable – for example because of overexploitation of fish, timber stocks etc

(4 marks)

- c) Response should show detailed knowledge and understanding of water or timber resource development. These resources are specifically mentioned in Specification A. Therefore, we should expect secure knowledge of the recent history of development of either of these resources to be evident either generally or in specific settings. An outline of the nature and volume of demand as it has changed in recent times is creditable paired with a review of how demand is met. An accurate definition of sustainability is certainly creditable. The exact content will depend on the chosen resource and settings. Sceptical comment can be expected and will probably be broadly justified but equally arguments for sustainability potential can also be expected and credited – probably based on careful management and conservation approaches.

Relevant exemplification, which contributes to illustration of points made, should be credited.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3) some reference to selected resource with sense of sustainability and accurate statements on development.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5) more detailed outline of selected resource and its development with accurate notion of sustainability and reference to potential.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7) more detailed outline of selected resource and its development with accurate notion of sustainability with measured comment on sustainability potential.

(7 marks)

Total for this question: 15 marks

WATER RESOURCES look for points such as:

DEMAND ASPECTS

Rising demand from increasing populations and levels of economic activity.

Different economic sectors, e.g. manufacturing, agriculture, domestic consumption - emphasis will depend on context.

Multiplicity of demands, e.g. potable domestic/industrial/commercial water, inland navigation, recreation, waste discharge.

Location of demand, especially in relation to supply.

SUPPLY ASPECTS

Water collection, treatment and distribution strategies - again emphasis will depend on context.

River catchment management - reservoir development, controls on discharge, ground water stocks and other basin components and flows.

Inter-basin transfers by pipeline.

De-salination.

Not all these demand/supply aspects will need to be covered.

SUSTAINABILITY ASPECTS

Negative impacts of supply strategies, especially on catchments with ecological/environment effects on river ecologies, on discharge regimes and related geomorphological outcomes such as sedimentation/flooding frequencies/intensities, possibly impact on populations displaced by supply schemes.

Potential for managing/curbing demand in relation to rising populations, rising living standards; possibility of recycling, etc., may be set out as presenting opportunities for sustainable development.

TIMBER RESOURCES

DEMAND ASPECTS

Rising demand from increasing populations and levels of economic activity.

Different sectors of production and consumption - manufacturing and construction; also, domestic consumption for construction and firewood - emphasis will depend on context.

Location of demand, especially in relation to supply.

SUPPLY ASPECTS

Managed forestry compared with clear felling - again emphasis will depend on context and perhaps distinguishing between soft and hard wood resources and MEDC/LEDC settings.

Inter-regional, including inter-continental transfers by shipping and overland transport.

Not all these demand/supply aspects will need to be covered.

SUSTAINABILITY ASPECTS

Potential for managing/curbing demand in relation to rising populations, rising living standards; possibility of recycling, etc.

Potential for sustainable development of timber by managed felling, replanting, etc., perhaps illustrated by softwood forestry, but with sceptical comment in relation to tropical hardwoods.

Impacts of supply strategies, locally and regionally on eco-systems, catchments, e.g. through biome destruction/degradation, soil degradation and erosion. Measured comment on global impacts of deforestation.

Question 2

- a) Response should show knowledge and understanding, and an ability to read and interpret the main features shown by a simple map of urban activities and urban change and knowledge and understanding of terms relating to urban change. Definition and clarification of terms *assimilation* and *discard* in terms of movements/shifts of high order central area functions within the central area and its vicinity creating areas of growth, change and dynamism and area of decline and dereliction, etc. (1-3 depending on detail and development). Comment connecting such definition to the southward / south-westward movement of activities on the map. Evidence on the map includes the distribution of pedestrianised areas, development of new shopping centres/malls, more and newer car parks, new arts and leisure facilities in the west compared with area of dereliction and vacancy in the north, clearly making a distinction between assimilation and discard. (1-3 depending on detail and development). For full marks, there should be some reference to evidence from the map Figure 2. **(4 marks)**
- b) Response should show knowledge and understanding of the causes of central area changes depending on which of the changes(s) are identified. Reasons might relate to changes referred to in part a) including differences in character and built environment between northern and southern parts of city centre shown, e.g. in terms of access or quality of buildings and built environment favouring south rather than north or in terms of deliberate town centre management/development policies favouring some areas rather than others e.g. pedestrianisation, planned encouragement and development of arts and leisure facilities. Such responses should be seen to be set out as reasons rather than simply further describing the changes evident on Figure 2. Alternatively broader changes in shopping patterns with successive waves of outward movement of retailing (food, white goods, household goods, etc), changes in shopping and leisure habits of population with emergent specialised shopping, and leisure/entertainment areas; importance of cars in transport shopping hence ring road configurations, location of parking facilities etc; release of buildings from former uses especially in town centre fringes as in the Industrial Heritage area in the north west corner or the arts and leisure facilities in a western sector, (1-3 per reason depending on detail with a trade off between breadth and depth of responses) **(4 marks)**
- c) Response should show knowledge and understanding of town centre change(s) accurately placed in specific context. The content will depend on the selected centre. It may well refer to decline in retailing, particularly certain sectors with its dispersal to more peripheral, out of town, ring road locations; change of character and use within the central area, zones of assimilation/discard, emergence of “dead hearts”, changes in functional composition and emergence of specialised shopping and leisure and entertainment activities. Reference to needs of local communities might distinguish between different age groups, car and non-car owners, local and more distant residents. Response should have a clear central area/fringe central area rather than an inner city focus. Relevant exemplification, which contributes to illustration of points made, should be credited.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3) Simple but accurate statements on the nature of change(s); more detailed statements without clear reference to specific area or needs of local communities. Lack of central area focus.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5) Fuller statements of change with clear reference to specified area. Some reference to needs of local communities.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7) Fuller statements of change with clear reference to specified area with measured comment on needs of local communities. **(7 marks)**

Total for this Question: 15 marks

Question 3

- a) Response should show ability to read the map and identify pattern(s) rather than make individual precise statements about features shown on the map – in other words the emphasis should be on pattern(s). Uneven patterns (1) North East or north **and** east concentrations (1) Coastal concentrations (1). Concentration on apparent growth poles/development poles, e.g. of integrated tourism complexes (1) relationships to distribution of airports, inland development along, at end of, main routes (1)
Features such as airports must be mentioned in relation to tourist development in order to be credited. **(4 marks)**
- b) Response should show an awareness from the map evidence that the development of tourism in Tunisia is indeed managed and further knowledge of typical management strategies. Exploitation of natural primary resources, e.g. coasts, deserts, oases, etc (1-2) concentration of investment in particular localities, integrated/complete tourism facilities (enclaves) especially on coast, notions of growth poles (1-2). Idea of zoning and of planned relationship with transport facilities especially airports (1-2) Idea of diverting development from inland more environmentally or culturally sensitive zones. (1-2) **(4 marks)**
- c) Response should show knowledge and understanding of the reasons for governments of LEDCs such as Tunisia developing tourism in recent years. It might focus on developing patterns of demand - increased mobility, greater affluence and developing requirements/needs of major tourist demand centres in the MEDCs and a perception of its potential as an agent of economic development and income earning/generation. References to the expanding “pleasure periphery” might be expected and be credited. The benefits of tourism as a leading sector with spread/trickle down effects, modernisation impulses and so on. Potential for using tourism income to conserve/enhance existing primary resources such as landscapes, eco-systems, communities etc. Wider references to raising the international and economic profile of country/region. A lack of other development opportunities and low opportunity costs of tourism development perhaps referring to the relative ease with which tourism might be developed particularly in the context of primary resources offered by places such as Tunisia. For example, climate, coastal environments, exotic landscapes etc. may also form part of a response or indeed its main part if full and convincing.

Comment might include the risks or benefits of the approach, brief comparison with other approaches to development, critiques or justification of approach and so on.

Relevant exemplification, which contributes to illustration of points made, should be credited – it need not be from Tunisia, but should be from the LEDW.

Level 1 Generic Descriptor (1-3) Some accurate statement of reasons for tourism development – possibly opportunities in relevant countries/regions or expansion of longer distance tourism or potential economic benefits etc.

Level 2 Generic Descriptor (4-5) Fuller statements on various reasons or depth and detail on one set of reasons – beginnings of comment.

Level 3 Generic Descriptor (6-7) Full account of various reasons with measured comment clearly made. **(7 marks)**

Total for this Question: 15 marks

Mark Scheme for Synoptic Essays

Preamble

Examiners should bear in mind that these questions are synoptic in nature and offer candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and understanding:

1. across a range of geographical subject matter;
2. of connections between the different aspects of geography in the specification;
3. of the importance, where relevant, of human perspectives on themes and issues.

Candidates are advised of this both in the Assessment Unit Rubric and in the Note to Candidate, which precedes the essay questions in Section B. Synoptic elements might therefore feature in answers matching all the criteria bands but can be expected to feature more prominently in higher mark bands. It will be seen that explicit synoptic content is a necessary feature of the two band ranges 19-24 and 25-30.

Additionally essay writing is an important vehicle for the demonstration of communication skills – at level 3 these refer to writing in a manner appropriate to purpose and complex subject matter; organising relevant information clearly and coherently using specialist vocabulary as appropriate and ensuring clarity of meaning through legible text, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar. Key Skills – Communication Level 3 C3.3 [QCA]; Para. 13 AS/A Level Geography Specification Outlines [QCA].

Synoptic content and communication aspects should be kept in mind when assessing the unit and are incorporated into the criteria bands set out below which refer to knowledge, understanding and skills. Indicate synoptic content using the letter ‘s’ in the margin as appropriate.

CRITERIA BANDS

Examiners will use the criteria below to evaluate the work, placing the candidate’s performance in the appropriate band and attributing the mark from the left-hand column appropriate to the question concerned. They should seek the best fit from the band descriptor – work adjudged to be in a particular band might not contain all the features attributed to that band.

25 – 30

A very good answer. Consistently relevant to the theme and to the demands of the question. Evaluates explicitly where required. Displays a very confident range of knowledge and understanding by using the appropriate terminology, critically referring to concepts and theory where necessary and establishing relationships between different physical and/or human factors and processes. Synoptic elements are a prominent feature and are fully integrated into the answer and used to purposeful effect in respect of the question’s requirements. Demonstrates, where relevant, either implicitly or explicitly awareness of human perspectives upon geographical themes and issues. Argues coherently and in an organized, logical and balanced fashion. Support is consistent, accurate and detailed. A well developed essay style. Detailed and sophisticated communication skills with fluent and cogent writing style.

19 – 24

A good answer, which remains relevant to the theme and demands of the question. Evaluation may now only be implicit. Displays a confident range of knowledge and understanding, but with a few omissions at the lower end, e.g. some terminology missing or some pertinent relationships left unexplored. Synoptic elements should be a feature of the answer and seen to be meeting the question's requirements. Some possibly rather uncritical reference to theory; some reference to awareness of human perspectives and decisions taking on geographical issues and problems. Argues well, but organisation may be suspect in places. Support is invariably there, but may not always be detailed. A competent essay style. Effective communication skills with accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.

13 – 18

A satisfactory answer ranging down to the mediocre, which always attempts, but not always succeeds to be relevant? Lacking in evaluation. Displays a reasonable grasp of knowledge, but understanding is suspect in places. Relevant theory and concepts might be mentioned but with basic uncritical application. The interconnections and relationships between different physical and/or human processes are briefly mentioned but understanding of their significance is limited. There is some synoptic content, which is relevant to the question. Argument and analysis are partial and become less significant in relation to mere description. Increasingly unbalanced as an answer, and the logic and organisation are clearly deficient. Support is not detailed here, occasionally inaccurate and barely consistent. The bare bones of an essay format. Appropriate communication skills so that meaning is almost invariably clear with adequate language skills. Possibly some spelling/punctuation/grammar errors.

7 – 12

A very mediocre answer, which is only occasionally relevant to both the theme and the demands of the question. Decidedly deficient in knowledge and understanding with only simplistic notion of relevant theory and concepts. Little if any relevance to inter-relationships between physical and/or human processes and factors or subject matter from other elements in the specification. Increasing irrelevance in a predominantly descriptive context. Clearly lacks an ability to organise material and may drift into another answer. Support is scanty and usually suspect. A weak, barely perceptible, essay format. Basic communication skills – many spelling errors and/or oddities of grammar and punctuation.

1 – 6

A very weak answer, which shows little attempt to follow the theme and the demands of the question. A very low level of knowledge and understanding, with even the simplest of concepts avoided. Very inaccurate and may completely miss the point. No idea of how to organise material with haphazard format, evidence of guesswork and little or no support. No attempt at an essay format. Little or no language and communication skills. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question 4

Different policies for agriculture are needed in different parts of the world. To what extent do you agree with this view?

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification (and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well) from a *population pressure and resource management* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scales and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is required for credit of 13 and over. However, it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Appropriate content might include:

A review of aspects of agriculture in different settings M/LEDW is the expected difference and answers based on the M/LEDW distinction certainly has potential for full marks.

In the MEDW expect to note the existence of surpluses, over production, over intensification and related environmental/landscape impacts including pollution of different types, soil erosion and degradation, etc., impacts on global trading patterns, fair trade issues, etc. Perhaps leading to and emphasis on policies intended to address these issues/problems. More up to date responses can be expected to refer to decline in farm incomes, decline in farming populations and so on.

Might also critically review existing and recent policies for agriculture - probably the CAP but also North American support systems leading to an expression of view that different alternative policies are needed for example which curtail subsidy/support because of impacts on LEDW farming - fair trade issues, etc. However, historical reviews of policy are inappropriate without a clear statement about what past policy implies for the present and future. Purely historical reviews of policy with no view expressed on the statement in the question should be limited to a maximum of 12.

In LEDW setting there may be a different emphasis with a focus on population/food demand and perhaps more general economic situation and therefore identifying need for policies, which generate and secure output, maintain output in face of sustained population growth in settings of chronic malnutrition and periodic famine. Problems of environmental degradation of different sort might be emphasised especially perhaps soil degradation, desertification, and so on. Policies might include land reform, adoption of appropriate technology, continuing with Green Revolution types strategies, investment, GM technology etc.

Similar policy needs might well be identified and would contribute to a sense of discussion - these might include conservation of water, soils, bio-diversity and so on. Overall sustainability might well be set out as desirable common goal and used to query the need for different policies and indeed to justify a need for similar policies in different areas or different policies for similar purposes. Sustainability is a synoptic opportunity.

Another perfectly legitimate approach might be to relate different (or similar) policy needs to different areas/environments, which may well be independent of the LEDW/MEDW dimension. For example, contrasts between agriculture policies in cold environments compared with rain forests, urban fringes or whatever type of geographical area the candidate chooses to use. Equally different contextual factors might be used to reflect different areas, e.g. in terms of population dynamics, population composition, economic development levels, nature of settlement patterns, physical/topographical conditions, climatic conditions, exposure/vulnerability to hazards and variety of such contexts certainly offers synoptic opportunities.

There are several ways in which this question could be answered. Synopticity will be further signified by content such as case study material/ exemplars, which make valid broad and specific comparisons and contrasts between different areas. A variety of scales are creditable - candidates might distinguish areas at a local up to international scale.

Case study material/ exemplars, which might come from anywhere. Legitimate distinctions might be made between different parts of the world - whether based on LEDW/MEDW contrast or other contrasts. Such distinctions will inform a response and give it substance and credibility and are extremely likely to produce synopticity, etc.

The analysis might lead candidates to conclude that similar or different policies are needed - either view is creditable as long as founded in a reasonable discussion approach. In the end, the candidate should come to a view on “to what extent?” - “any extent” is creditable as long as it is reasonable and related to the preceding contents and discussion.

Question 5

Many factors are relevant to the successful management of urban areas. Discuss the validity of this view.

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification (and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well) from a *managing cities – challenges and issues* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scale and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is required for credit of 13 and over. However, it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Appropriate content might include:

An attempt to define terms management and successful in order to direct and manage the response. The question of success might well be revisited throughout the response in satisfying the command to *discuss*.

Different factors in urban systems such as:

Social aspects, perhaps with housing aspects with contrasts between shanty town-informal housing or not perhaps contrasted, but perhaps legitimately compared with housing issues in MEDW settings, e.g. variations in housing quality, house building issues, homelessness, etc. Other social factors may be incidence and control of crime, health aspects and so on.

Demographic aspects such as levels and patterns of migration, population growth rates, population structure.

Economic aspects, nature of employment markets upper/lower circuits, etc., in LEDWs, employment generation and retention, operation of labour markets, urban labour market characteristics in terms of skill and educational levels perhaps comparing and contrasting LEDW and MEDW settings.

Environmental issues such as localised and regional pollution of different types as experienced both in LEDW and MEDW might also be reviewed casting urban areas in an unfavourable light.

Transports and communication patterns, flows as factors and associated problems on congestion, pollution and different requirements of urban populations in different parts of the world.

Broad trends in urban development and the problems associated with them e.g. decentralisation, counter-urbanisation in the MEDW contrasting with (overall) continuing urbanisation in LEDW.

Physical aspects of the urban setting such as climatic setting, nature of river catchments, vulnerability to natural hazards such as flooding and so on.

Technical economic capacity of governments and non-governments to manage resources, political factors and values and attitudes of different populations and decision-makers; levels of wealth and funding for management etc. This group of factors will likely be related to levels of economic development.

Clearly many of these groups of factors are inter-related. Responses, which cover two or more of the above aspects, are clearly addressing the assigned task and there are many opportunities to demonstrate synopticity, especially if they are exemplified/illustrated from different parts of the world and/or different types of city.

Equally, a case study (studies) approach to managing urban area(s) may well be fully creditable as long as it critically scrutinises the factors concerned. Such approaches may be expected to focus on judgments as to whether the urban area management reviewed was successful or not.

Detailed synoptic content might refer to:

The context of population change, natural growth, migration patterns perhaps drawing useful distinctions between, urbanising, suburbanising, counter urbanising population and employment movements with implications for pressure on land, services, infrastructure within cities, on urban peripheries and indeed beyond urban areas altogether. This should/could be informed by knowledge and understanding of general urbanisation processes and patterns of urban growth in different parts of the world.

The context of the level and pace of economic development, the stage of economic development, levels of material consumption levels, e.g. car ownership, energy consumption and other measures of human welfare affecting the type of problems and issues arising in different settings and how they might be addressed.

The type and location of the city-urban area, its physical/environmental setting, the nature of its economy, employment, its economic history very likely to be connected with its level of development, but also its dominant functions and place in the global/national/regional urban hierarchy, e.g. distinctions might well be drawn between a “world metropolis” such as London or another type such as an old port, old industrial city in the UK or indeed anywhere else. Similarly, LEDW/MEDW distinctions, post-industrial, new industrial, pre-industrial distinctions, etc.

There are several ways in which this question could be answered. Synopticity will be signified by content such as case study material/exemplars, which make valid broad and specific comparisons and contrasts between, say LEDW and MEDW settings, but such contrasts are not necessary given the wording of the question and other synoptic aspects are outlined above. Overall, examiners should be content that responses have covered a number of factors in such depth and diversity so as to have provided a synoptic answer. Detailed and diverse case studies and exemplars and/or themes will certainly inform the response and give it substance and credibility.

Straightforward narrative accounts of urban management schemes/strategies from which relevant factors can be inferred may be awarded up to 18 marks as long as there is some summarising comment, which relate the content to the terms of the question.

However, the question clearly looks for a discussion approach. Discussion might revolve around there being many or few factors, on the degree of success or not, on the relative importance of the factors outlined. The response should come to a concluding view - any view is creditable as long as it is reasonable and related to the preceding contents and discussion.

Question 6

With reference to areas that you have studied, discuss the extent to which recreation and tourism industries can be used to successfully promote economic development.

This question is intended to enable candidates to engage in broad human and physical geographical themes represented elsewhere in the specification and quite possibly and creditably from outside the specification as well from a *recreation and tourism* specialisation. It should enable the introduction and elaboration of such human and physical geographical themes and allow for the human environment relationship to be explored. The response can be exemplified and illustrated at a variety of scale and contexts and the assigned task enables a discussion of values and policy aspects to be incorporated.

See generic scheme for criteria band – examiners are reminded that some synoptic content is required for credit of 13 and over. However, it is difficult to imagine an answer of reasonable quality without some synoptic content.

Appropriate content might well include an attempt to define recreation and tourism, an outline of their development, especially planned development with reasons for - in terms of employment, income generation, its use of primary resources in areas which have experienced economic decline/or limited economic development are “in need” of economic development. The “attractive” characteristics of recreation and tourism as growth industries - factors in explaining growth especially in demand aspects. The effects of growth sectors and areas in the economy/region such as income/employment generation, multiplier effects, trickle-down/spread effects – reference to regional development models such as Myrdal.

The disadvantages of recreation and tourism in terms of possible seasonality, vulnerability to changes in taste. Critique of benefits may be in terms of selective impact of income/employment generation between different groups, extent of leakage of tourism income and hence reduced multiplier effects. Negative impact of tourism – as a cost possibly economic costs, polarised growth, diversion of resources, opportunity costs of tourist development; social costs – cultural dilutions; environmental costs associated with congestion etc. Potential for unequal development, dependency and so on might creditably attract negative comment.

Measured use of tourism development models should be credited if appropriate e.g. use of Butler to show that recreation and tourism can be successfully used if managed carefully throughout – for example to ward of decline at later stages. More perceptive candidates might demonstrate awareness of the significance of time dimension.

Review of the varying character of regions where recreation and tourism might be promoted e.g. areas of economic decline – the causes and nature of decline and its impacts, especially on employment, income and the character of the built/commercial/industrial environment. The opportunities offered by such localities for tourism – most likely heritage tourism will be reviewed. Such areas might be old industrial areas, areas of other economic decline, ports, waterside areas even mining areas, which find it difficult to replace employment in modern times. Alternatively/additionally area in the LEDW experiencing low levels of economic development and low material living standards but perhaps offering natural and cultural primary resources for recreation and tourism, especially for MEDW markets.

In both LEDW and MEDW cases, the relationship of typical tourist activities to the needs of the local populations and the suitability of the local environment is relevant. An argument could be made that it did not meet those needs or that such needs would have to be modified e.g. by training and retraining programmes. The intractability of economic, social and environment problems in many MEDW or LEDW regions compared with what recreation and tourism by themselves might offer.

Responses may creditably extend into other sectors/activities, which might contribute towards economic development, including other industries, and this would be synoptic but clearly should be used in a comparative sense with tourism and recreation remaining as a focus.

Case study material/exemplars which might come from anywhere in the MEDW and/or LEDW. Detailed case study(ies) may well be creditable especially where they go beyond the merely descriptive and have analysis embedded in them. Variety of examples, especially in terms of types of regions are considered are likely to contribute towards synopticity.

Examiners are reminded that the question refers to both recreation **and** tourism and whilst we can sympathise with responses which concentrate on tourism, nevertheless both should be considered and necessarily for 25-30 band marks.

Responses, which make no reference to “areas....studied”, should be held to a maximum of 18 marks.

The question clearly requires a discussion approach and the response requires the candidate to come to a view – any conclusion is creditable as long as it is reasonable and related to the preceding contents and discussion.